DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 274 TM 003 282

AUTHOR	Epstein, Glenda
TITLE	The Minneapolis Voluntary Urban Transfer Program: Clinton and Burroughs Elementary Schools: 1970-71. An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Grades; *Elementary School Students; Interviews; *Parent Attitudes; Questionnaires; *Racial Integration; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes; Technical Reports; *Transfer Programs; *Voluntary Integration
IDENTIFIERS	Minneapolis Public Schools

ABSTRACT

A voluntary, one-way transfer program of 59 white students from one elementary school to another for the purpose of developing an integrated education program is described. Ways of measuring the effects of the program include interviews with the mothers both parents, and with the teachers at both schools, and questionnaires administered to students and teachers at both schools. Results indicate: (1) Parents as a whole were pleased with the program; (2) The children's enthusiasm for school increased; (3) The parents felt that the program could be strengthened by having buses available more often to take parents and children to and from the school; (4) Attendance rate increased significantly; (5) Teachers felt that the transferred students were a positive influence on the school; (6) One school preferred curious students, whereas the other preferred self-reliant ones; and (7) Students at one school perceive school to be more difficult than those at the other school. The findings of the study are generally positive. (CK)

ED 084274

TM 003 282

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Minneapolis Voluntary Urban Transfer Program
Clinton and Burroughs Elementary Schools: 1970-71
An Evaluation

This paper is a summary of findings from a longer report prepared by Leaetta M. Hough and Lowell W. Hellervik of Personnel Decisions, Inc., an independent research agency, under the general direction of the Research and Evaluation Department of the Minneapolis Public Schools.

Glenda Epstein wrote the summary.

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

November 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table of Contents

	Page
Measuring Instruments and Techniques.	1
Parents' View of the Program.	2
Parents Like Clinton Atmosphere	2
Observation of Children's Behavior.	3
Parents Suggest Changes	4
Attendance Data	4
Teacher Attitudes	5
Preferred Qualities of Students	6
School Survey Questionnaire Taps Teacher Views.	7
Students View Their Class - The My Class Inventory	11
Sociometric Data.	14
Scholastic Achievement.	14
Median Percentile	15
Conclusions	15

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Minneapolis Voluntary Urban Transfer Program at Clinton and Burroughs Elementary Schools: 1970-71 An Evaluation

Summary

In the fall of 1970 a voluntary, one-way transfer program of 59 white students was initiated from the Burroughs Elementary School area (less than one percent minority), to Clinton Elementary (over 40 percent minority students). The program was initiated by parents who were interested in developing a program in which their own children and the Clinton students could obtain an integrated education. A total of 32 families became involved in the program in 1970 and 24 more families (30 more children) became involved the following year. The program was completely voluntary. In some cases, the children initiated their involvement or participation in the program and in other cases, one or both parents initiated the participation.

Measuring Instruments and Techniques

Several instruments and techniques were used to measure the effects of the program. Interviews were conducted with the mothers and, as often as possible, with both parents to learn about parental attitudes toward the transfer program and parental perceptions of any changes in their children's behavior. At least one parent from each of twenty-two out of the thirty-two families whose children were transferred into Clinton was interviewed at home.

Interviews were also conducted with the teachers of Burroughs and Clinton to learn about their attitudes toward the program and their perceptions of any change that had occurred in student behavior. To measure the school "climate" at Clinton, the teachers at Clinton were administered the "Preferred Qualities of Students" and the "School Survey" questionnaires. Teachers at Burroughs also responded to these questionnaires so that a comparison between the two school climates could be made. The "My Class" questionnaire tapped school climate from the student's point of view. This instrument was administered to the students of both schools and comparisons were made among three subgroups -- Burroughs students, transferred students, and indigenous Clinton students. The students of Clinton Elementary School also responded to the "My Four Best Friends" questionnaire so that extent of integration could be assessed.

Student files were examined for data concerning school attendance and scholastic achievement.

Parents' View of the Program

Content analysis of the interviews indicated that 95% of the parents were "pleased", "very pleased", or "extremely pleased" with the program as a whole. More detailed questionnaires revealed that 86% of the parents felt their children enjoyed school more this year compared with last year, 9% didn't know, and 5% (one) said her child liked school less. Some of the comments made were: "I can't keep my child home from school even when he/she is sick"; "sometimes if my child misses the bus, he/she walks the four miles"; and "my child didn't want to go at first, but now he/she loves it."

One of the most frequently mentioned topics was the relaxed atmosphere at Clinton. More specifically, parents felt that their children "liked" "the lack of regimentation," "the lack of structure," "not being afraid to make mistakes," and "being able to move around without getting into trouble." Students also apparently liked their teachers; 77% of the parents specifically mentioned that the teachers were one of the major reasons why their children liked school. Other things apparently liked by the students were 1) the other children, 2) the variety of academic and after-school programs, 3) the bus ride, and 4) the hot lunch program. More parents said their children liked the bus ride and lunch program than said their children disliked them.

Playground facilities were most frequently mentioned as inadequate and specific complaints about fighting and roughness generally were related to the playground activities.

Parents Like Clinton Atmosphere

Parents were also asked what they specifically liked or disliked about the program. An overwhelming majority, 20 out of the 22 parents, said they liked the relationships they had with the Clinton teachers. Fifty-nine percent said the teachers made them feel welcome at the school and this friendly atmosphere contributed to their being involved with the

school and its function. In fact, 73% of the parents said they were more involved and 41% said they were much more involved at Clinton than they had been at the schools their children had attended the previous year. Some wives specifically mentioned that their husbands were now interested and active in school functions.

Three parents mentioned that they liked the greater individual attention that was given to their children. Other comments about the program were: "I worry less because my child doesn't need to walk to and from school in the cold" (3 parents), and "it's less work for me because I don't have to make lunches" (2 parents). One parent, however, worried more about her child because some of the students were more physical and rough than the students at the school the child had attended the previous year. In comparison with this statement were statements by two wives who had not wanted their child to enroll at Clinton but had gone along with their husband's wish to send or the child's wish to attend Clinton. These two said, "the experience has taken away my fears about busing."

Observation of Children's Behavior

Parents were also asked whether they had observed any change in their children's behavior over the school year. According to the parents of the bused children, one of the most noteworthy changes in their children's behavior was an increased enthusiasm for school. Parents felt that their children thought "learning was fun at Clinton." Many of the parents related this increased liking for school to the more relaxed climate at Clinton and several of the parents felt that this less anxious attitude toward school and getting good grades had carried over to their behavior in general. Most of these parents also mentioned that this more relaxed atmosphere was not detrimental to learning, but rather made learning fun. In fact, 23% of the parents thought their children had improved their academic skills. Many parents also felt that their children had greater self-confidence in themselves. Some parents seemed to feel this was related to the nongraded system at Clinton and others thought that, for their children, it was related to the "less uptight" atmosphere at Clinton.

In the area of discipline, two parents felt their children were better

behaved than previously and four parents thought their children were more physically aggressive. Of these four parents, one thought this did not represent a negative change, one was uncertain whether maturation or the transfer experience contributed to the change, one thought the physically aggressive behavior had been learned on the bus, while interacting with other transferred students, and the other parent felt the roughness on the playground contributed to the more physical behavior of her child. In a somewhat similar vein, five parents felt their children were using more words like "ain't" and were swearing more often. These parents, similar to the ones mentioned above, had different hypotheses as to where their children had learned these words.

Parents Suggest Changes

The parents were also asked about changes they would like to see made in the program. Some of the suggestions were related strictly to the program and others were directed to the Clinton school in general. The majority of parents felt the program could be strengthened by having buses available more often to take parents and children to and from the school. Most parents felt that the frequency of bus runs was inadequate and created inconveniences for them. Another large percentage of parents felt the physical plant at Clinton should be improved. Of the parents mentioning this, ten specifically mentioned the playground facilities as indadequate, three mentioned the library facilities, and one mentioned the music program.

Attendance Data

The attendance data supported the parents' perceptions that the children liked school. During 1969-70, the attendance rate for the transferred students was 94.8%. Each transferred student missed an average of 8.7 days during 1969-70. However, during 1970-71, each transfer student missed only an average of 5.8 days. During the year the students were transferred, they attended school 96.8% of the time -- significantly more than they had the previous year.

The students indigenous to the Clinton area also had better attendance during 1970-71. During the 1969-70 year, the indigenous students attended an average of 91.3% of the possible school days. During 1970-71, however, they attended class 93.7% of the time; each indigenous student attended an average of 3.1 days a year more than he had attended the previous year. Though it is difficult to infer causation from this evidence, it seems that students enjoyed school at Clinton. A more cautious interpretation is that, at least, the students did not attend less school as a result of the transfer program.

Teacher Attitudes

The teachers both at Clinton and Burroughs were interviewed about their attitudes toward school and their perceptions of the transfer program. The teachers at Burroughs felt no change had occurred at Burroughs as a result of the program, even though they described most of the transferred students as being good students and "ones that a teacher liked to have in class." They said that only one or two students from a class had left Burroughs to transfer to Clinton. In their judgment, this was an insignificant number in relation to the entire class.

The Clinton teachers felt that the program was running smoothly, and that there had been no adverse effects upon anyone concerned. They felt that the students had mixed well with each other -- "You couldn't tell a bused student from a nonbused student." They felt that the transferred students were a positive influence on the indigenous Clinton students. In their opinion, several of the transferred students were success models -- academically and socially, for the indigenous Clinton students. Some teachers felt classroom behavior had improved and speculated that it was partially a result of the more academically oriented transfer students' desire to listen and learn, and their applying pressure on their nonattentive friends to listen to the teacher. The teachers also felt that this peer pressure was successful only because the students were friends.

Though the Clinton teachers did not know if the students liked school more or less than they had before, the teachers did feel that most of the students enjoyed school.

Teachers also felt that playground behavior had improved over the previous year. However, the cause of the change was difficult to determine. Other programs and ideas were implemented in Clinton during 1970-71, and it is difficult to conclude that the Clinton students learned better playground behavior from the transfer students.

Preferred Qualities of Students

The "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire was administered to the Clinton and Burroughs teachers. In this questionnaire teachers are asked to rank order in terms of importance for boys and for girls various adjectives and behavioral descriptions. Average rankings reflect the relative importance of those qualities in a school. Any difference between schools presumably indicates a difference in the climate of the two schools.

Scores in this questionnaire indicated that Clinton teachers ranked "Curious" significantly less important than did Burroughs teachers, and Clinton teachers ranked "Assertive and Self-reliant" significantly more important than did Burroughs teachers. Perhaps the Clinton teachers responded to the environment at Clinton which they perceived as requiring more aggressiveness and consequently felt those behaviors were more important than did the Burroughs teachers. This interpretation does seem justified because: (1) Clinton teachers thought Assertiveness and Self-reliance were more important for boys than for girls (although the contrast was not significant); (2) compared with Burroughs teachers, Clinton teachers thought Assertiveness and Self-reliance were more important (statistically significant) for boys; and, (3) Clinton and Burroughs teachers did not rank "Assertive and Self-reliant" significantly different for girls. The Clinton teachers did differentiate what was important, in their opinion, for boys from that which was important for girls. They thought that aggressive and self-reliant behavior was more important for boys than for girls, and as mentioned earlier, this may be a result of their perceiving these behaviors to be more adaptive for boys than for girls in their particular environment. This discussion, then, suggests that, based upon the differences in teachers' rankings, there are some differences in climate at the two schools.

Teachers also differed significantly in their rankings on the dimension of curiousity. Based on data presented earlier in this text the teachers at Clinton probably spend a greater proportion of their time maintaining classroom discipline than do Burroughs teachers, and consequently, Clinton teachers may have come to regard curiousity as potentially another disruption.

The comparison between preferences of teachers at Clinton and preferences of teachers at Burroughs does not indicate whether any change has occurred at Clinton or Burroughs as a result of the program. However, the data do suggest that the transferred students attended classes at Clinton which had a slightly different environment than the environment at Burroughs. The climate at Clinton was characterized by a preference for students that are responsible, trustworthy, assertive, and self-reliant. The climate at Burroughs, however, was characterized by a preference for curious students.

School Survey Questionnaire Taps Teacher Views

The School Survey questionnaire was distributed to the entire teaching staff of both Clinton and Burroughs Elementary Schools. Forty-seven percent of the Burroughs staff members (14 persons) responded to the questionnaire and 63% of the Clinton staff members (15 persons) responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire tapped another aspect of the climates at Clinton and Burroughs, namely their feelings toward: (1) administrative practices, (2) professional work load, (3) nonprofessional work, (4) educational materials and equipment, (5) buildings and facilities, (6) educational effectiveness, (7) student evaluation, (8) special services, (9) school-community relations, (10) supervisory relations, (11) colleague relations, (12)voice in educational program, (13) performance and development, (14) financial incentives, and (15) reaction to the survey. The definitions of these categories will be given as the differences between attitudes of the Clinton and Burroughs teachers in these categories are discussed.

Administrative Practices

The administrative practices category is composed of items dealing with the fairness of administrative decision, administrative interest in staff welfare, and the School Board's concern for education. Both schools were moderately positive on all the administrative items and there were only minor differences between the schools on individual items.

Professional Work Load

Sixty percent of the Clinton teachers felt that the work load was fair and 86% of the Burroughs teachers felt the work load was fair. Clinton staff felt more free and more able to deal with individual differences of the students than did the Burroughs staff. Forty-seven percent of the Clinton staff felt positive about the size of the classes, whereas, only 21% of the Burroughs staff felt positive about class sizes.

Nonprofessional Work Load

The only item on which differences were statistically different in the nonprofessional work load categories dealt with the adequacy of clerical assistance. Sixty-four percent of the Burroughs teachers responded positively to the item, while only 27% of the Clinton teachers did so. However, 53% of the Clinton teachers responded favorably to the amount of administrative paper work and only 29% of the Burroughs teachers responded favorably.

Educational Materials and Equipment

Burroughs personnel felt significantly more favorable toward the adequacy of their reference and library materials than did the Clinton staff. However, in the following areas Clinton personnel felt more favorable than the Burroughs staff: quality of supplementary materials, quality of instructional materials, availability of student materials, availability of aids and equipment, adequacy of supplies, and the introduction of new materials and equipment.

Building and Facilities

Both groups, however, felt that the facilities (condition of classrooms and offices, storage, ventilation, lighting, desk space, and lounges) were inadequate (80% of the Clinton staff and 93% of the Burroughs staff thought the personal facilities in their respective schools were inadequate).

Educational Effectiveness

Concerning educational effectiveness, large attitudinal differences existed between the two schools. The average percent favorable for Burroughs was 75, and for Clinton, the average percent favorable was 53. Even so, on some items more Clinton staff members responded positively than Burroughs staff members. Examining the individual items on which differences

existed illustrates the nature of the differences between the schools. One-hundred percent of the Burroughs staff responded favorably to an item concerning the educational orientation of the community whereas only 13% of the Clinton staff did. Concerning parental interest in education, 93% of the Burroughs personnel responded favorably but only 60% of the Clinton staff did. The Clinton staff felt more positive about the learning climate at their school than the Burroughs staff felt about the learning climate at Burroughs. Thirty-six percent of the Burroughs personnel and only 13% of the Clinton personnel felt their respective schools lacked an atmosphere of learning.

Student Evaluation

The Clinton staff felt that more discipline was required with their students than did the Burroughs staff; 67% of the Clinton staff said that the students "seem to need an unusual amount of discipline," whereas only 7% of the Burroughs staff agreed with that item. In the student evaluation which dealt with student absences, 87% of the Clinton staff thought the students were absent too often, but no one at Burroughs thought so. Twenty-nine percent of the Burroughs staff felt that the Burroughs students were more interested in getting grades than in learning; whereas only 7% of the Clinton staff felt that way about Clinton students. The Burroughs staff also tended to feel that their students were more courteous than did the Clinton staff; 86% of Burroughs staff and 53% of the Clinton staff responded favorably to an item dealing with student courtesy.

Special Services

Significant differences on individual items existed in the special services category also. Eighty-six percent of the Burroughs staff responded favorably toward their library services, but only 47% of the Clinton staff did. However, responses of the Clinton staff were more positive toward the adequacy of Clinton special programs than were Burroughs staff toward their schools's special programs. Sixty percent of Clinton staff and 21% of the Burroughs staff responded favorably.

School-Community Relations

Burroughs teachers felt that the parental pressure on the school was considerable; 57% of the Burroughs staff felt that the parents exerted

too much influence or pressure, whereas only 13% of the Clinton staff felt parents exerted too much pressure. Another significant difference concerned the extent to which the staff felt that their respective schools attracted residents to the neighborhood. Seventy-one percent of the Burroughs staff felt that the Burroughs school system was "one big reason why people choose to live in the community," whereas only 33% of the Clinton teachers felt that way.

Colleague Relations

Clinton staff members felt more positive about colleague relations at their school than the Burroughs personnel felt. The average percent favorable for the category for Clinton was 81% and for Burroughs, 58%. A significantly greater proportion of the Clinton staff, 80%, compared with 43% of the Burroughs staff, felt that cooperation existed among the faculty.

Voice in Educational Program

The attitudes of the staff at the two schools are very similar, though the Burroughs staff tended to feel (not significant) that they had a greater voice in curriculum development than did the Clinton staff. Eighty-six percent of the Burroughs staff and 60% of the Clinton staff responded positively to the item.

Performance and Development

Though the attitudes were very similar, Burroughs personnel tended to feel: (1) greater opportunity for personal growth; Burroughs 93%, compared with Clinton 67%; (2) promotions were more fair; Burroughs, 64% vs. Clinton 40%; (3) appraisals were more fair; Burroughs 93% vs. Clinton 67%; (4) the in-service educational program helped to improve their professional skills; Burroughs 71%, compared with Clinton 47%; (5) they would recommend their school to prospective teachers as a good place to work more often than would the Clinton staff -- 86% of the Burroughs staff and 60% of the Clinton staff responded favorably to this item.

Financial Incentives

The Burroughs staff tended to feel: (1) they had a greater voice

in salary matters; 57% of the Burroughs staff and 33% of the Clinton staff responded favorably; (2) there were more incentives for advanced training; Burroughs 86%, Clinton 60%; (3) there were greater rewards for outstanding work; Burroughs 36%, Clinton 13% (neither group felt particularly positive toward the rewards they were given for doing an outstanding job); (4) within their school district, the salaries were fair; Burroughs 71%, Clinton 40%. The Clinton staff, however, did feel more positive than the Burroughs staff toward their salaries compared with salaries in other school districts; Clinton 73%, Burroughs, 57%.

Students View Their Class - The My Class Inventory

Students at Clinton and Burroughs elementary schools completed the "My Class" Inventory so that the children's perceptions of their respective schools could be determined.

The My Class Inventory is a list of 45 statements which measures the elementary pupil's perception of his classroom environment, especially of the behavior of his classmates. The child responds yes or no to each statement. Examples: "Most children in this class are good friends", and "Children in our class fight a lot."

Five aspects of the elementary classroom are measured: Cohesiveness, Friction, Competetiveness, Difficulty, Satisfaction. Results for each of these scales are discussed next.

Cohesiveness Scale

The Cohesiveness scale indicates the extent to which the pupils view themselves as being friends. In a highly cohesive environment they report that they like to play with children in their class both at school and after school, that their best friends are in their class, that they are close friends and like each other, and that they like to work together as teams on assignments and projects.

Scores on the My Class Inventory indicated that the indigenous Clinton students and Burroughs students were equally cohesive. However, the transfer students were significantly less cohesive than either the Burroughs or indigenous Clinton students. Some possible explanations for this are: (1) the transfer students were not accepted by the indigenous Clinton students

and hence were not close friends; (2) the transfer students did not accept the indigenous Clinton students; (3) the transfer students now have more friends, neighborhood and school friends, and consequently do not closely identify with their classmates; and/or (4) transfer students identify with other transfer students rather than their classmates. Based upon data presented in the sociometric section, the transfer students appear to have both been accepted by Clinton students and accept Clinton students as their friends. Also, transfer students did not tend to name a large number of their neighborhood friends as their best friends. Instead, they tended to name other transfer students who often were in different grades, and consequently, this probably decreased the transfer students average score on the cohesiveness scale which measures cohesiveness with respect to school class.

Friction Scale

The results for the "friction" scale indicated average scores for both transfer and indigenous Clinton students are significantly higher than for Burroughs students. The Friction scale indicates the degree to which unfriendly interpersonal relations are reported. High Friction scores would be evidenced by pupils reporting each other as "pushy", mean, not liking other children, wanting to have their own way, and generally being unfriendly.

Since many of the items in the scale refer to fighting, perhaps the transfer students have been exposed to more physical roughness than existed at the school they previously attended. Thus, the transfer students could have learned such behavior from their Clinton peers. The conclusion is consistent with previous findings in this study.

Competitive Scale

The Competitiveness scale reports the extent to which pupils see each other as being competitiors in achievement, doing classwork and assignments, and pursuing rewards such as grades. They see each other as "racing to finish", wanting to be first or do best.

Indigenous Clinton students find school more competitive than do either the transfer students or Burroughs students. This finding is not consistent with other results of the evaluation and is consequently difficult to interpret.

Difficulty Scale

Higher scores on the Difficulty scale indicate that pupils report their school work as being hard. High difficulty environments find pupils reporting that some of them need help and that the class work is, in general, hard to accomplish. In "easy" environments pupils report that the work is not difficult and that most children can do or know how to do the assignments.

The difficulty level of the two schools is probably similar, though indigenous Clinton students perceive school to be more difficult than transfer or Burroughs students according to student answers for the difficulty dimension.

Satisfaction Scale

Both transfer and indigenous Clinton students are significantly less satisfied with their school than Burroughs students. Though this was not consistent with the attendance data and the perceptions of the Clinton teachers and the parents of the transfer students, this finding is not necessarily inconsistent either. Since both pre- and posttest measures were not obtained, no information concerning change over the year was available for this instrument. However, compared to Burroughs students, Clinton students were less satisfied with school as measured by the "My Class" questionnaire.

The behavior of the students at Clinton was also probably more physical and rough than, for example, the behavior of the Burroughs students. Data from several instruments suggested this was true. To an item in the "School Survey" questionnaire, 67% of the Clinton teachers said that students "seem to need an unusual amount of discipline," whereas only 7% of the Burroughs staff agreed with that item. The teachers also ranked "assertive and self-reliant" significantly more important for boys than did Burroughs teachers. The evaluators hypothesized that the Clinton teachers were responding to what they felt was adaptive behavior for boys in the Clinton environment. Some of the parents, 18%, felt that their children were more physically aggressive than previously. Since the climate at Clinton did seem to be more physically rough and aggressive, perhaps those transfer students who became more aggressive over the year did learn such behavior at Clinton.

Sociometric Data

The transfer students were accepted very well by both the indigenous white and minority students. The sociometric data indicated that a) the minority students named transfer students as their friends as often as would be expected in a perfectly integrated world; and b) transfer students named minority students as their friends only slightly less often than would be expected in a perfectly integrated world. This seems particularly noteworthy since prior to the transfer program most of the transfer students probably had very few friends who would be classified as minority.

Scholastic Achievement

As a group, attending Clinton Elementary School had little or no effect on the scholastic achievement level of students transferred from the Burroughs area. Changes which did occur, although not statistically significant, were in a favorable direction. Transfer students tended to gain vocabulary and reading comprehension skills to a greater degree than expected of students throughout the city.

As a group, the indigenous Clinton children did not gain as much as most Minneapolis children from the Fall of 1970 to the Fall of 1971. Fifth grade students tended to hold their positions, but fourth grade students dropped significantly in reading comprehension.

All conclusions about changes in achievement scores, whether gains or losses, should be considered skeptically in view of the small number of students involved. Pre- and posttest information was available on comparable tests for only 50 indigenous Clinton students and 22 transfer students.

Scholastic achievement data are based on the following numbers of children:

Grade	Clinton	Transferred
3-4	7	4
4-5	20	9
5-6	23	9

Scores from comparable tests for children in grades one and two were not available.

When the entire student body of Clinton is considered, i.e. indigenous and transfer children, it is apparent that very substantial academic gains occurred from Fall 1970 to Fall 1971.

Median percentiles for the Gates-MacGinitie reading vocabulary and comprehension tests are shown below. These medians are based on all children tested at Clinton in Fall 1970 and Fall 1971.

		Median Percentile		
	Grade	Fall 1970	Fall 1971	Gain
Vocab-ulary	3-4	25	37	+12
	4-5	15	46	+31
	5-6	41	59	+18
Compre-hension	3-4	25	42	+17
	4-5	20	48	+28
	5-6	35	48	+13

This table shows that the average third grader at Clinton scored at the 25th percentile in vocabulary in the Fall of 1970 and at the 37th percentile in the Fall of 1971 when in the fourth grade. The two groups of children are not the same, since transfers, moves, etc. caused some difference in the population.

Further analysis is needed to determine why these large gains occurred. Possibly some high scoring children were transferred to Clinton in Fall 1971 who were not at Clinton in Fall 1970. Such an influx could cause some of the gains although the relatively small numbers involved would probably not account for the large observed gains.

Our best estimate, based on rather scanty achievement data, is that:

1. The bused children continued to achieve at their previous level, or improved somewhat - relative to the rest of the city.
2. The indigenous Clinton children continued to achieve at their previous level - or dropped somewhat - relative to the rest of the city.
3. Clinton School improved greatly, relative to the rest of the city, although the reason for the substantial gain is not clear.

Conclusions

Overall, then, the findings of this study were generally positive. However, it is difficult to attribute the changes to the voluntary transfer program since other ideas and programs were also initiated at Clinton during the 1970-71 school year. Regardless of the source of the changes or lack of changes, persons involved in the program do appear to be pleased with the results of the program as indicated a) by the

twenty-four new families who enrolled students in the transfer program; b) by the only one family who withdrew their child from the program; and c) by the very high proportion of the parents (95%) who were "pleased", "very pleased", or "extremely pleased" with the program as a whole.

This evaluation was done by Personnel Decisions, Inc. a private research company.